

EXHIBIT B

**Authorities Providing for Interpretation of State Antitrust Laws
Consistent with or more Narrowly than Federal Antitrust Law**

	State	Authority
A	Alabama	<i>Ranch House, Inc. v. Amerson</i> , 146 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1203 (N.D. Ala. 2001).
B	Alaska	<i>Curtis v. Providence Health & Servs.</i> , No. 3:18-cv-0281, 2019 WL 1051179, at *3-5 (D. Alaska, Mar. 5, 2019).
C	Arkansas	<i>In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel)</i> , 787 F. Supp. 2d 1036, 1042 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (explaining limited authorities interpreting the Arkansas antitrust statute)
D	Arizona	Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 44-1412.
E	California	<i>Vinci v. Waste Mgmt., Inc.</i> , 36 Ca. App. 4th 1811, 1814 n.1 (Cal. Ct. App. 1995); <i>Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.</i> , 269 F. Supp. 2d 1213, 1224-25 (C.D. Cal. 2003).
F	Colorado	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-4-119.
G	District of Columbia	D.C. Code § 28-4515.
H	Hawaii	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480-3.
I	Idaho	Idaho Code Ann. § 48-102(3).
J	Illinois	740 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 10/11.
K	Iowa	Iowa Code § 553.2; <i>Davies v. Genesis Med. Ctr.</i> , 994 F. Supp. 1078, 1103 (S.D. Iowa 1998).
L	Kansas	<i>Smith v. Philip Morris Companies, Inc.</i> , 335 P.3d 644, 652-53 (Kan. Ct. App. 2014); <i>Orr v. Beamon</i> , 77 F. Supp. 2d 1208, 1211-12 (D. Kan. 1999).
M	Maine	<i>McKinnon v. Honeywell Intern., Inc.</i> , 977 A.2d 420, 424 (Me. 2009).
N	Maryland	Md. Code Com. Law § 11-202(a)(2); <i>Gen. Nutrition Corp. v. Javaid</i> , Civil Action No. 17-1074, 2018 WL 1089758, at *1-2 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 26, 2018).
O	Michigan	Mich. Comp. Laws § 445.784.
P	Minnesota	<i>Midwest Commc'ns, Inc. v. Minn. Twins, Inc.</i> , 779 F.2d 444, 454 (8th Cir. 1985); <i>Keating v. Philip Morris, Inc.</i> , 417 N.W.2d 132, 136 (Minn. Ct. App. 1987); <i>State v. Duluth Bd. of Trade</i> , 121 N.W. 395, 399 (Minn. 1909).
Q	Mississippi	<i>Walker v. U-Haul Co. of Miss.</i> , 734 F.2d 1068, 1070 n.5 (5th Cir. 1984).
R	Nebraska	Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 59-829.
S	Nevada	Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 598A.050.

T	New Hampshire	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 356:14; <i>Minuteman, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 795 A.2d 833, 836 (N.H. 2002), <i>superseded on other grounds</i> , N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:4-a (2008) (granting indirect purchaser standing).
U	New Mexico	N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-15.
V	New York	<i>Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Abrams</i> , 520 N.E.2d 535, 539 (N.Y. 1988).
W	North Carolina	<i>Rose v. Vulcan Materials Co.</i> , 194 S.E.2d 521, 530 (N.C. 1973).
X	North Dakota	<i>Beckler v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.</i> , No. 09-04-C-00030, 2004 WL 2475100, at *4 (N.D. Dist. Ct. Sept. 21, 2004).
Y	Oregon	Or. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 646.715(2).
Z	Rhode Island	R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-2(b).
AA	South Dakota	S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-22; <i>Byre v. City of Chamberlain</i> , 362 N.W.2d 69, 74 (S.D. 1985).
BB	Tennessee	<i>Spahr v. Leegin Creative Leather Prods.</i> , No. 2:07-CV-187, 2008 WL 3914461, at *12-14 (E.D. Tenn. Aug. 20, 2008).
CC	Utah	Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-3118; <i>All Weather Exteriors Distributing, Inc. v. California Wholesale Material Supply Inc.</i> , No. 2:06-CV-346, 2007 WL 445281, at *4 & n.33 (D. Utah Feb. 6, 2007) (formerly cited as Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-926).
DD	West Virginia	W. Va. Code Ann. § 47-18-16; <i>Gray v. Marshall County Bd. of Educ.</i> , 367 S.E.2d 751, 755 (W. Va. 1988).
EE	Wisconsin	<i>State v. Waste Mgmt. of Wis., Inc.</i> , 261 N.W.2d 147, 153 & n.12 (Wis. 1978).